



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/113,094	07/10/1998	KIA SILVERBROOK	IR14US	7673

7590                    02/21/2003

KIA SILVERBROOK  
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD  
393 DARLING ST  
2041 BALMAIN NSW, 2041  
AUSTRALIA

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

YE, LIN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT      [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/113,094	SILVERBROOK, KIA
	<b>Examiner</b> Lin Ye	<b>Art Unit</b> 2612

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Attached.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Attached.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a)a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Response to Arguments*

1. As for the Applicant's arguments filed on 1/5/2003 regarding the propriety of the examiners referral to enter the substitute specification, the examiner disagrees. It is not the moving of the list of references from the back to the front that is the problem. The problem is the exhaustive list of "related" applications altogether. In the original specification, this long list of cases was, at least, divided into different subject matter headings. Now, with the substitute specification, this is gone - leaving the public with absolutely no guidance as to how each and every cited application is relevant. It should be expressly noted that nothing, in the MPEP that entitles the inventor to such a long list of cross-referenced applicants. 37 CFR 1.78 is no different –it merely states, "Cross-references, ... may be made when appropriate". In this situation, the examiner has deemed that such a long listing is not appropriate-as it provides no guidance or clarification.

It is immaterial that other examiners have treated this situation differently. Matters such as these are formally within the individual examiner's discretion.

The marked-up version of the substitute specification does not mention the Applicant deletes the original specification from pages 58-64 which divided the related applications into their relevant subject matter. This is created another confusion to the examiner.

Correction is required.

2. Applicant's proposed amendments filed on 1/5/2003 to the claim 1 will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

Art Unit: 2612

For claim 1 would require further search and consideration as to the merits for regarding the amended preamble anticipate whith the claim - "a method of colour correcting a sensed image before printing by a **hand held** camera system".

***Conclusion***

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Lin Ye** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3250**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R Garber can be reached on **(703) 305-4929**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to:

**(703) 872-9314**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

Lin Ye  
February 13, 2003



WENDY R. GARBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600